

Accurate Neutralino Relic Density Computations in Supergravity Models

JORGE L. LOPEZ, D. V. NANOPOULOS, and KAJIA YUAN

*Center for Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics, Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-4242, USA*

and

*Astroparticle Physics Group, Houston Advanced Research Center (HARC)
The Woodlands, TX 77381, USA*

ABSTRACT

We investigate the question of the proper thermal averaging of neutralino annihilation amplitudes which possess poles and thresholds, as they impact on the calculated neutralino relic density and therefore on the cosmological viability of supersymmetric models. We focus on two typical resonances, namely the Z boson and the lightest Higgs boson (h). In the context of supergravity models with radiative electroweak symmetry breaking, an exploration of the whole parameter space of the model is possible and the overall relevance of these sophisticated analyses can be ascertained. As an example we chose the minimal $SU(5)$ supergravity model since the presence of such poles is essential to obtain a cosmologically acceptable model. We find that the proper thermal averaging is important for individual points in parameter space and that the fraction of cosmologically acceptable points is increased somewhat by the accurate procedure. However, qualitatively the new set of points is very similar to that obtained previously using the usual series approximations to the thermal average. We conclude that all phenomenological analyses based on the previously determined cosmologically allowed set remain valid.

February, 1993

1. Introduction

Much speculation has gone on for some time about the nature of the “observed” astrophysical dark matter in the Universe [1]. The lightest supersymmetric particle – the lightest neutralino – is a prime candidate for a cold dark matter relic [2,3], and as such it would constitute an essential ingredient in contemporary structure formation ideas [4]. A consistency check for a possible dark matter candidate χ in the Big-Bang cosmology is provided by an independent lower bound on the age of the Universe. The present relic abundance $\Omega_\chi = \rho_\chi/\rho_{crit}$ must be bounded above by $\Omega_\chi h_0^2 < 1$ [5], where $0.5 < h_0 < 1$ is the Hubble parameter in units of $100 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. Weaker bounds follow from direct astrophysical determinations of Ω_0 . Also, in inflationary cosmology $\Omega_0 \equiv 1$ [6] and the observational bound is also satisfied.

In the specific case of the lightest neutralino, the computation of Ω_χ has been attempted in several supersymmetric (minimal [2,3,7], non-minimal [8], supergravity without [9,10], and with [11,12,13] radiative electroweak breaking) models to varying degrees of approximation for nearly a decade. The details of the particle physics model come into play mainly in the calculation of the total annihilation amplitude $\chi\chi \rightarrow all$ and its thermal average. Under normal circumstances, thermal considerations allow one to conclude that center-of-mass energies close to the minimal one ($\sqrt{s} = 2m_\chi$) are the most likely ones [3], and that a rapidly converging series expansion around this point should suffice [14]. For two-body final states with masses $m_{1,2}$ to be “open” (in the non-relativistic limit) it is necessary that $m_1 + m_2 \leq 2m_\chi$. Since χ is the lightest supersymmetric particle, only non-supersymmetric final states contribute (*i.e.*, $q\bar{q}, l^+l^-$, W^+W^- , $ZZ, hh, hA, hH, Zh, ZA, \dots$, where h, A, H are the supersymmetric Higgs bosons).

Such series expansions, however, have been noted to fail badly when s -channel resonances and/or new-channel thresholds are present in the annihilation amplitude [15,16]. The discussion in these references provided a solid ground for tackling such problems, but their practical applications were only briefly explored. On the other hand, supergravity models with radiative electroweak symmetry breaking [17] provide a fertile testing ground for such sophisticated techniques, since the complete mass spectrum and couplings of the model can be specified in terms of very few parameters [18]. In particular, the occurrence of poles and thresholds in the annihilation amplitude can be studied over the whole parameter space of these models, in order to determine whether the more accurate results provided by these techniques change significantly the cosmologically allowed region of parameter space

or not. These special considerations play a very important role in the cosmological viability of the longest-standing GUT model, namely the minimal $SU(5)$ supergravity model [19]. It has been recently pointed out [12,13] that, because the stringent proton decay constraints on this model force the most efficient annihilation channel mediators to be very heavy, the neutralino relic density is small enough basically only near the lightest Higgs (h) and Z -boson resonances, *i.e.*, for $m_\chi \approx \frac{1}{2}m_{h,Z}$. Thus, a more accurate treatment, as described in Refs. [15,16], appears mandatory in this case.

The purpose of this paper is twofold. Firstly, we present a quantitative discussion of the accurate thermal averaging necessary in the context of this class of models, and explicitly show the breakdown of the usual series expansion near the poles and its not-so-good accuracy not-so-near the poles. Secondly, we perform a complete recalculation of the relic density in the minimal $SU(5)$ supergravity model, and show the effects of the more accurate treatment and the explicit role of the s -channel resonances (h, Z) and the $\chi\chi \rightarrow hh$ threshold. We find that even though the re-computed values of the relic density are shifted relative to our previous (less accurate) results, the overall fraction of the parameter space which is cosmologically allowed is not qualitatively changed, and thus all predictions based on the previously determined cosmologically allowed set remain valid.

2. The thermal average

The neutralino relic density is given by the expression [14]

$$\Omega_\chi h_0^2 = 1.555 \times 10^8 (m_\chi / \text{GeV}) h(0) q(0), \quad (2.1)$$

where $h(0) = 3.91$ is the effective number of entropy degrees of freedom today, and $q(0)$ is obtained by solving the Boltzmann equation for $q \equiv n/(T^3 h(T))$, with n the actual number density of χ particles at temperature T . This equation is given by

$$\frac{dq}{dx} = \lambda(x)(q^2 - q_0^2)(x) \quad (2.2)$$

with $x = T/m_\chi$, q_0 the analog of q but with the χ particles in thermal equilibrium, and

$$\lambda(x) = \left(\frac{4}{45}\pi^3 G_N\right)^{-1/2} \frac{m_\chi}{\sqrt{g(T)}} [h(T) + \frac{1}{3}m_\chi x h'(T)] \langle \sigma v_{\text{Mø}} \rangle, \quad (2.3)$$

where G_N is the gravitational constant and $g(T)$ the effective number of energy density degrees of freedom. For a detailed discussion of how to evaluate all the terms appearing

in the Boltzmann equation and how to solve the equation itself, see *e.g.*, the Appendix in Ref. [10]. The novelty in the present discussion is in the evaluation of the thermal average factor $\langle \sigma v_{\text{M}\phi 1} \rangle$, where $v_{\text{M}\phi 1}$ is the Møller velocity [15]. The general expression for this quantity is [15]

$$\langle \sigma v_{\text{M}\phi 1} \rangle = \frac{1}{8m_\chi^4 T K_2^2(x^{-1})} \int_{4m_\chi^2}^{\infty} \sigma \cdot (s - 4m_\chi^2) \sqrt{s} K_1(\sqrt{s}/T) ds, \quad (2.4)$$

where K_i are the modified Bessel functions of order i , and σ is the total annihilation cross section. To make contact with previous work we rewrite $\langle \sigma v_{\text{M}\phi 1} \rangle$ in Lorentz invariant form as follows

$$\langle \sigma v_{\text{M}\phi 1} \rangle = \frac{1}{4m_\chi^5 x K_2^2(x^{-1})} \int_{4m_\chi^2}^{\infty} ds (s - 4m_\chi^2)^{1/2} K_1(\sqrt{s}/xm_\chi) w(s), \quad (2.5)$$

with [14]

$$w(s) = \frac{1}{4} \int d\text{LIPS} |\mathcal{A}(\chi\chi \rightarrow \text{all})|^2. \quad (2.6)$$

The usual series expansion for the thermal average follows from the observation that only for $x \lesssim 0.1$ is the Boltzmann equation sensitive to the value of $\lambda(x)$. In this regime the argument of K_1 in Eq. (2.5) is always larger than $\sqrt{s}/xm_\chi > 2/x \gtrsim 20$, and the Bessel function ($K_1(y) \sim \sqrt{\pi/2y} e^{-y}$, $y \gg 1$) dies away quickly with increasing $\sqrt{s}$. Therefore a series expansion of $w(s)$ around $\sqrt{s} = 2m_\chi$ should converge quickly. The resulting series of integrals can be done analytically giving [14]

$$\langle \sigma v_{\text{M}\phi 1} \rangle = \frac{1}{m_\chi^2} [w - \frac{3}{2}(2w - w')x + \frac{3}{8}(16w - 8w' + 5w'')x^2 + \mathcal{O}(x^3)]_{s=4m_\chi^2} \quad (2.7a)$$

$$\equiv a + bx + cx^2 + \mathcal{O}(x^3). \quad (2.7b)$$

The problem with this approximation when $w(s)$ has a pole can be best seen in a simple analytical example. Let us consider the case where an s -channel resonance with mass m_R and width Γ_R dominates $w(s)$, *i.e.*,

$$w(y) = \mathcal{C} \frac{y(y-1)}{(y-y_R)^2 + \gamma_R^2}, \quad (2.8)$$

where $y = s/4m_\chi^2$, $y_R = m_R^2/4m_\chi^2$, and $\gamma_R = \Gamma_R m_R/4m_\chi^2 = (\Gamma_R/m_R)y_R$. This form in fact applies to $\chi\chi \rightarrow h, Z \rightarrow f\bar{f}$ when $m_f = 0$, with $\mathcal{C}$ some dimensionless function of the couplings (see Eqs. A.2 and A.3). We then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma v_{\text{M}\phi 1} \rangle &= \frac{2\mathcal{C}}{m_\chi^2 x K_2^2(x^{-1})} \int_1^\infty dy \frac{y(y-1)}{(y-y_R)^2 + \gamma_R^2} \sqrt{y-1} K_1(2\sqrt{y}/x) \\ &\rightarrow \frac{2\mathcal{C}}{\sqrt{\pi} m_\chi^2 x^{3/2}} \int_1^\infty dy \frac{y(y-1)}{(y-y_R)^2 + \gamma_R^2} \sqrt{\frac{y-1}{y}} e^{-2(\sqrt{y}-1)/x}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

where the limiting form holds in the x -regime of interest ($x \lesssim 0.1$). Expanding $w(y)$ around $y = 1$ and performing the integrals analytically one arrives at the series expansion in Eq. (2.7) with

$$a = 0, \tag{2.10a}$$

$$b = \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{(1 - y_R)^2 + \gamma_R^2}, \tag{2.10b}$$

$$c = \frac{3}{4} \frac{1}{(1 - y_R)^2 + \gamma_R^2} \left[1 - \frac{10(1 - y_R)}{(1 - y_R)^2 + \gamma_R^2} \right]. \tag{2.10c}$$

For illustrative purposes we have computed $\langle \sigma v_{M\phi 1} \rangle$ exactly using Eq. (2.9) and also using the expansions in Eqs. (2.7),(2.10). The results are shown in Fig. 1 (2) (in arbitrary units) for the $Z(h)$ -pole, where we have taken $x = 0.05$ and $\Gamma_R/m_R = 0.0274$ (0.0002) for $R = Z(h)$. Clearly, sufficiently away from the poles ($y_R \gg 1$ or $y_R \ll 1$) the series expansions approach the exact result, while near the poles these are highly inaccurate. In particular, the second-order approximation ($a + bx + cx^2$) fails badly right above the poles ($y_R < 1$) since it gives negative thermal averaged annihilation cross sections.

The degree of inaccuracy of the series expansions can be better appreciated by examining the ratios $\langle \sigma v_{M\phi 1} \rangle_{exact} / \langle \sigma v_{M\phi 1} \rangle_{approx}$, as shown in Fig. 3 for both resonances. Below the pole ($y_R > 1$) one can clearly see the quicker convergence of the higher-order approximation. The peak in the $a + bx + cx^2$ line is due to the series expansion changing sign at $y = 0.75$, giving negative (non-sensical) results for $0.75 < y \lesssim 1$. The overall result is that as one approaches the poles from below ($y_R > 1$) the exact thermal average first becomes larger than naively expected (relic density smaller), then near the poles it becomes smaller (relic density larger), until above the poles where it quickly approaches the naive estimate (in first order, $a + bx$). In practice this means that the neutralino relic density distributions as a function of the neutralino mass will show not-as-narrow (broader) and not-as-deep (shallower) pole structures, and that these will be asymmetric.

The bottom row in Fig. 3 shows a detail of the convergence of the series expansions to the exact result below the pole. It is perhaps somewhat unexpected that the expansions are relatively inaccurate not-so-near the poles, *i.e.*, for $y_R = 2$, $m_\chi \approx 0.7(\frac{1}{2}m_R)$, which for the Z -pole gives $m_\chi \approx 32 \text{ GeV}$. The reason for this behavior can be understood by studying the integrand in Eq. (2.9) with $w(y)$ in exact and Taylor-expanded (around $y = 1$) forms. These are shown as functions of y in Fig. 4 for both poles and representative values of y_R . The solid/dotted/dashed lines correspond to the integrand evaluated using

$w(y)$ in exact/up-to-first-derivates/up-to-second-derivatives forms. Clearly, the poles at $y = y_R$ are ‘missed’ by the expansions for $y_R \gtrsim 1$. However, for sufficiently high values of y_R the exponential kills-off the poles completely, although they ‘last longer’ for the much narrower h -pole. Note also the quantitative effect of the expansion up to second-derivatives (dashed lines) relative to that up to first-derivatives (dotted lines). In practical relic density calculations only the first derivatives of $w(y)$ are usually kept (which corresponds approximately to $\langle \sigma v_{M\phi 1} \rangle = a + bx$) and therefore good accuracy is not reached until considerably away from the poles (from below; from above convergence is faster). Since $w(y)$ usually receives additional contributions from non-resonant channels which are likely to overshadow the contributions from resonant channels when away from the corresponding resonances, in practice the behavior away from the poles is not easily distinguishable.

3. Application to the minimal $SU(5)$ supergravity model

As mentioned above, the study of the relic density of neutralinos requires the knowledge of the total annihilation amplitude $\chi\chi \rightarrow \text{all}$. The latter depends on the model parameters to determine all masses and couplings. Previously [10] we have advocated the study of this problem in the context of supergravity models with radiative electroweak symmetry breaking, since then only a few parameters (five or less) are needed to specify the model completely. In particular, one can explore the whole parameter space and draw conclusions about a complete class of models. The ensuing relationships among the various masses and couplings have been found to yield results which depart from the conventional minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) lore, where no such relations exist. Here we study a novel aspect of these correlations, namely the occurrence of poles and thresholds in the annihilation amplitude. We choose to work with the minimal $SU(5)$ supergravity model [19] since its five-dimensional parameter space is strongly constrained by the proton lifetime and a sufficiently small neutralino relic density. In fact, the latter is cosmologically acceptable only because of enhancements in the neutralino annihilation amplitude near s -channel Z and h resonances. Our purpose here is to determine whether an accurate computation of the thermal average changes significantly the previously (inaccurately) determined cosmologically allowed region of parameter space.

We have performed an extensive search of the five-dimensional parameter space of the model. The five parameters are: the top-quark mass (m_t), the ratio of Higgs vacuum expectation values ($\tan\beta$), and three universal soft-supersymmetry breaking terms (the

gaugino mass $m_{1/2}$, the scalar mass m_0 , and the trilinear scalar coupling A). The sign of the Higgs mixing parameter μ is also undetermined. Our search accepts only those points which give adequate radiative electroweak symmetry breaking and satisfy all known phenomenological constraints in the sparticle and Higgs spectrum, as described in Ref. [18]. We also include the very restrictive proton decay constraint [20,13] with the unification scale calculated using two-loop gauge coupling unification including the effect of light supersymmetric thresholds [21]. The remaining points in parameter space (~ 2000 per sign of μ), which have $\tan\beta = 1.5, 1.75, 2.0$, were then used to compute the neutralino relic density using the methods of Ref. [10] for solving the Boltzmann equation and the accurate thermal averaging procedure of Ref. [15], as described in Sec. 2.

Since in this model $m_\chi \lesssim 65$ GeV (and even $m_\chi \lesssim 50$ GeV if improved lower bounds on m_h are further imposed [22]), and the Higgs masses obey $m_h \lesssim 100$ GeV, $m_{A,H} > 500$ GeV, only the h and Z s -channel resonances contribute to $\chi\chi \rightarrow f\bar{f}$, with f a light quark or lepton.¹ In addition, the channel $\chi\chi \rightarrow hh$ can be kinematically allowed (showing a threshold effect) in some regions of parameter space ($m_\chi > m_h$). Note that in the present approach to calculating $\langle\sigma v_{M\phi 1}\rangle$, in principle *all* kinematically allowed channels contribute, since $\sqrt{s} \geq 2m_\chi$ is allowed. This is in contrast with the traditional approach where $\sqrt{s} = 2m_\chi$ is fixed and only two-body channels with $m_1 + m_2 \leq 2m_\chi$ contribute. However, the farther away $\sqrt{s}$ is from its lower limit of integration in Eq. (2.5), the least it will contribute to the total integral (see Eq. (2.9) where $\sqrt{y} = \sqrt{s}/2m_\chi$). This is exemplified in Fig. 4 which shows that for $y \gtrsim 2$, the contribution to the integral is negligible. Important annihilation channels that one would need to worry about (besides $\chi\chi \rightarrow f\bar{f}, hh$) include $\chi\chi \rightarrow W^+W^-, ZZ$, which have h -pole and Z -pole (only W^+W^-) contributions when the neutralino is not a pure gauge eigenstate. For $m_\chi \lesssim 50$ (65) GeV, these channels open up for $y \gtrsim 2.6, 3.4$ (1.55, 2.0) respectively. Thus, only the W^+W^- channel (which requires $\sqrt{s} > 2M_W$) could be relevant. To give any significant contributions, *i.e.*, $y = s/4m_\chi^2 \lesssim 2$, one would need $m_\chi \gtrsim 57$ GeV, but in this case $y_Z < 0.65$ and $y_h < (m_h/114 \text{ GeV})^2 \lesssim 0.77$ (for $m_h \lesssim 100$ GeV), and the poles are not encountered. Therefore, in the following we have only included the $\chi\chi \rightarrow f\bar{f}, hh$ annihilation channels. The exact expressions for $w(s)$ are given in the Appendices, including all interference terms, which have been typically neglected in previous analyses. We note that even near the poles (for $y \lesssim 3$) the

¹ In our calculations, the h -width has been obtained for every point in parameter space including the $h \rightarrow f\bar{f}$ and $h \rightarrow \chi_1^0\chi_1^0$ (when kinematically allowed) channels.

interference terms are generally smaller than the squared terms, although for large y (when all contributions are unimportant anyway) the two contributions can be comparable.

The results of our calculations are shown in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 where $\langle\sigma v_{M\phi 1}\rangle$ has been computed exactly and in the series expansion to first order ($a + bx$), respectively. The overall result is not very clear from these figures, although some shifts of the points are evident. In particular, around the Z -pole ($m_\chi \approx \frac{1}{2}M_Z$) one can see that the pole structure in the exact case is broader, shallower, and asymmetric (lower below the pole) relative to the approximate solution, as anticipated in Sec. 2. Moreover, there is a $\approx 53\%$ (27%) increase in the number of cosmologically allowed points ($\Omega_\chi h_0^2 < 1$) for $\mu > 0$ ($\mu < 0$) relative to the approximate result. This shift is however not qualitatively significant. In fact, the distribution of cosmologically allowed points in the $(m_{\chi_1^\pm}, m_h)$ plane (see Fig. 7) is very close to that obtained previously using the series expansion (see Fig. 2 in Ref. [21]).

To show the effect on the relic density of poles and thresholds of the annihilation amplitude, we show in Fig. 8 in the (m_χ, m_h) plane those points in parameter space where $\Omega_\chi^{exact}/\Omega_\chi^{approx} > 1$. These points correspond to $\langle\sigma v_{M\phi 1}\rangle_{exact}/\langle\sigma v_{M\phi 1}\rangle_{approx} < 1$, and according to Sec. 2 (see Fig. 3) should occur very *near* and *above* the poles ($y_{Z,h} \lesssim 1$). This is precisely what Fig. 8 shows, where the Z -pole ($m_\chi \approx \frac{1}{2}M_Z$) and the h -pole ($m_\chi \approx \frac{1}{2}m_h$) are denoted by dashed lines. In Fig. 9 we show those points where $\Omega_\chi^{exact}/\Omega_\chi^{approx} < 0.5$, which correspond to $\langle\sigma v_{M\phi 1}\rangle_{exact}/\langle\sigma v_{M\phi 1}\rangle_{approx} \gtrsim 1$, and according to Fig. 3 should occur *below* the poles ($y_{Z,h} \gtrsim 1$). This is again borne out by the results in Fig. 9. Moreover, for $m_\chi \approx m_h$ the $\chi\chi \rightarrow hh$ channel opens up and a threshold effect causes a drop in $(\Omega_\chi h_0^2)_{exact}$. These points show up in Fig. 9 along the diagonal. It is interesting to note that these points lie slightly *above* the diagonal, *i.e.*, $m_\chi \lesssim m_h$. In the usual series approximation, this channel would not open up until $m_\chi > m_h$. In the exact treatment, even for $m_\chi \lesssim m_h$, $\sqrt{s} \geq 2m_h$ is possible and the channel becomes kinematically allowed. However, as discussed above, only values of $\sqrt{s}$ close to its minimum value ($\sqrt{s} = 2m_\chi$) can contribute significantly, and this is why the effect only occurs very near the diagonal. For $m_\chi \geq m_h$ both methods give similar results.

4. Conclusions

We have investigated the question of the proper thermal averaging of neutralino annihilation amplitudes which possess poles and thresholds, following the methods of Ref.

[15]. We have focused on two typical resonances in supersymmetric models, namely the Z boson and the lightest Higgs boson (h). In the context of supergravity models with radiative electroweak symmetry breaking, an exploration of the whole parameter space of the model is possible and the overall relevance of these sophisticated analyses can be ascertained. As an example we chose the minimal $SU(5)$ supergravity model since the presence of such poles is essential to obtain a cosmologically acceptable model. We have found that the proper thermal averaging is important for individual points in parameter space. Also, the fraction of cosmologically acceptable points is increased somewhat by the accurate procedure. However, qualitatively the new set of points is very similar to the previously allowed set.² We conclude that all phenomenological analyses based on the previously determined cosmologically allowed set remain valid.

Acknowledgments: This work has been supported in part by DOE grant DE-FG05-91-ER-40633. The work of J.L. has been supported by an SSC Fellowship. The work of D.V.N. has been supported in part by a grant from Conoco Inc. The work of K.Y. has been supported by a World-Laboratory Fellowship. We would like to thank the HARC Supercomputer Center for the use of their NEC SX-3 supercomputer.

² Concurrently with our calculation there has appeared an analogous one [23] which reaches similar qualitative conclusions. More quantitative comparisons are not possible given the lack of detail in Ref. [23].

Appendix A. Function $w(s)$

In this Appendix we present the full set of explicit expressions for the Lorentz invariant function $w(s)$ that we used in this work. In what follows, all the couplings except those specified otherwise can be found in Ref. [10]. As discussed in Sec. 3, in the minimal $SU(5)$ supergravity model, the only relevant annihilation channels are $\chi\chi \rightarrow \bar{f}f$ and $\chi\chi \rightarrow hh$, therefore, $w(s)$ can be written as

$$w(s) = \frac{1}{32\pi} \left\{ \sum_f c_f \theta(s - 4m_f^2) \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_f^2}{s}} \tilde{w}^{(\bar{f}f)}(s) + \theta(s - 4m_h^2) \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_h^2}{s}} \tilde{w}^{(hh)}(s) \right\}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where c_f is the color factor of conventional fermion f ($c_f = 3$ for quarks and $c_f = 1$ for leptons), the summation in the first term runs over all conventional quarks and leptons except the top quark.

A.1. $\chi\chi \rightarrow \bar{f}f$ annihilation

There are totally eight types of contributions to $\tilde{w}^{(\bar{f}f)}(s)$:

(1) Z-boson exchange:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{w}_Z^{(\bar{f}f)}(s) = & \frac{4}{3} \frac{|G_A^{\chi\chi Z}|^2}{(s - M_Z^2)^2 + \Gamma_Z^2 M_Z^2} \left\{ 12 |G_A^{ffZ}|^2 \frac{m_\chi^2 m_f^2}{M_Z^4} (s - M_Z^2)^2 \right. \\ & \left. + \left[|G_A^{ffZ}|^2 (s - 4m_f^2) + |G_V^{ffZ}|^2 (s + 2m_f^2) \right] (s - 4m_\chi^2) \right\}; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

(2) CP-even Higgs-boson ($S_1 = h, S_2 = H$) exchange:

$$\tilde{w}_S^{(\bar{f}f)}(s) = \left| \sum_{i=1,2} \frac{G_S^{\chi\chi S_i} G_S^{ff S_i}}{s - m_{S_i}^2 + i\Gamma_{S_i} m_{S_i}} \right|^2 (s - 4m_f^2)(s - 4m_\chi^2); \quad (\text{A.3})$$

(3) CP-odd Higgs-boson (A) exchange:

$$\tilde{w}_P^{(\bar{f}f)}(s) = \left| \frac{G_P^{\chi\chi A} G_P^{ff A}}{s - m_A^2 + i\Gamma_A m_A} \right|^2 s^2; \quad (\text{A.4})$$

(4) Z-A interference:

$$\tilde{w}_{ZP}^{(\bar{f}f)}(s) = \frac{8\epsilon m_\chi m_f}{M_Z^2} \text{Re} \left[\left(\frac{G_P^{\chi\chi A} G_P^{ff A}}{s - m_A^2 + i\Gamma_A m_A} \right) \left(\frac{G_A^{\chi\chi Z} G_A^{ff Z}}{s - M_Z^2 + i\Gamma_Z M_Z} \right)^* \right] (M_Z^2 - s)s; \quad (\text{A.5})$$

(5) sfermion ($\tilde{f}$) exchange:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{w}_{\tilde{f}}^{(\bar{f}f)}(s) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i,j} \Big\{ & (A_+^i A_+^j + B_+^i B_+^j) \left[\mathcal{T}_2 - 2(m_\chi^2 + m_f^2) \mathcal{T}_1 + ((m_\chi^2 + m_f^2)^2 + 4m_\chi^2 m_f^2) \mathcal{T}_0 \right] \\ & + (A_-^i A_-^j - B_-^i B_-^j) \left[\mathcal{T}_2 - 2(m_\chi^2 + m_f^2) \mathcal{T}_1 + (m_\chi^2 - m_f^2)^2 \mathcal{T}_0 \right] \\ & + A_+^i A_+^j \left[(m_\chi^2 + m_f^2) s - 4m_\chi^2 m_f^2 \right] \mathcal{Y}_1 + A_-^i A_-^j (m_\chi^2 - m_f^2) s \mathcal{Y}_1 \\ & + (B_+^i B_+^j - B_-^i B_-^j) \left[\mathcal{Y}_2 + (m_\chi^2 + m_f^2)^2 \mathcal{Y}_1 \right] \\ & + (A_+^i B_+^j + A_+^j B_+^i) \epsilon m_\chi m_f \left[4(m_\chi^2 + m_f^2) \mathcal{T}_0 - 4\mathcal{T}_1 + s \mathcal{Y}_1 \right] \\ & - (A_+^i B_+^j - A_+^j B_+^i) \epsilon m_\chi m_f \mathcal{Y}_0 \Big\} (s, m_\chi^2, m_f^2, m_{\tilde{f}_i}^2, m_{\tilde{f}_j}^2); \quad (\text{A.6})\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_0, \mathcal{Y}_2, \mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_0$ are some auxiliary functions which are given in Appendix B, and the summation runs over two sfermion mass eigenstates $\tilde{f}_{1,2}$ for each corresponding fermion f . Also, we have introduced the following notation for sfermion couplings:

$$A_\pm^i \equiv G_L^i (G_L^i)^* \pm G_R^i (G_R^i)^*, \quad (\text{A.7a})$$

$$B_\pm^i \equiv G_L^i (G_R^i)^* \pm G_R^i (G_L^i)^*, \quad (\text{A.7b})$$

with

$$G_L^i = G_L^{\chi f \tilde{f}_L} U_{1i} + G_L^{\chi f \tilde{f}_R} U_{2i}, \quad (\text{A.8a})$$

$$G_R^i = G_R^{\chi f \tilde{f}_L} U_{1i} + G_R^{\chi f \tilde{f}_R} U_{2i}, \quad (\text{A.8b})$$

where U is the orthogonal matrix which rotates $\tilde{f}_{L,R}$ into $\tilde{f}_{1,2}$.

(6) Z - $\tilde{f}$ interference:

$$\tilde{w}_{Z\tilde{f}}^{(\bar{f}f)}(s) = \text{Re} \left(\frac{G_A^{\chi\chi Z} G_A^{ffZ}}{s - M_Z^2 + i\Gamma_Z M_Z} \right) I_{Z\tilde{f}}^{(1)} + \text{Re} \left(\frac{G_A^{\chi\chi Z} G_V^{ffZ}}{s - M_Z^2 + i\Gamma_Z M_Z} \right) I_{Z\tilde{f}}^{(2)} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}I_{Z\tilde{f}}^{(1)} = \sum_i \Big\{ & 4B_+^i \epsilon m_\chi m_f \left[\left(\frac{s}{M_Z^2} - 3 \right) - \left(s + \left(\frac{s}{M_Z^2} - 3 \right) (m_\chi^2 + m_f^2 - m_{\tilde{f}_i}^2) \right) \mathcal{F}(s, m_\chi^2, m_f^2, m_{\tilde{f}_i}^2) \right] \\ & - A_+^i \left[(2(m_\chi^2 + m_f^2)s + \frac{8m_\chi^2 m_f^2}{M_Z^2} s - 2(m_\chi^2 + m_f^2 - m_{\tilde{f}_i}^2)^2 - 16m_\chi^2 m_f^2) \mathcal{F}(s, m_\chi^2, m_f^2, m_{\tilde{f}_i}^2) \right. \\ & \left. + s + 2(m_\chi^2 + m_f^2 - m_{\tilde{f}_i}^2) \right] \Big\}, \quad (\text{A.10a})\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}I_{Z\tilde{f}}^{(2)} = \sum_i A_-^i \Big[& (2(m_\chi^2 - m_f^2)s - 2(m_\chi^2 + m_f^2 - m_{\tilde{f}_i}^2)^2 + 8m_\chi^2 m_f^2) \mathcal{F}(s, m_\chi^2, m_f^2, m_{\tilde{f}_i}^2) \\ & + s + 2(m_\chi^2 + m_f^2 - m_{\tilde{f}_i}^2) \Big]. \quad (\text{A.10b})\end{aligned}$$

(7) S - $\tilde{f}$ interference:

$$\tilde{w}_{S\tilde{f}}^{(\bar{f}f)}(s) = \sum_{j=1,2} \text{Re} \left(\frac{G_S^{\chi\chi S_j} G_S^{ff S_j}}{s - m_{S_j}^2 + i\Gamma_{S_j} m_{S_j}} \right) I_{S\tilde{f}}, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where

$$I_{S\tilde{f}} = \sum_i \left\{ -2A_+^i \epsilon m_\chi m_f \left[2 + (s - 2(m_\chi^2 + m_f^2 - m_{f_i}^2)) \mathcal{F}(s, m_\chi^2, m_f^2, m_{f_i}^2) \right] \right. \\ \left. - B_+^i \left[s + ((m_\chi^2 + m_f^2 - m_{f_i}^2)s - 8m_\chi^2 m_f^2) \mathcal{F}(s, m_\chi^2, m_f^2, m_{f_i}^2) \right] \right\}. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

(8) A - $\tilde{f}$ interference:

$$\tilde{w}_{A\tilde{f}}^{(\bar{f}f)}(s) = \text{Re} \left(\frac{G_P^{\chi\chi A} G_P^{ff A}}{s - m_A^2 + i\Gamma_A m_A} \right) I_{A\tilde{f}}, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where

$$I_{A\tilde{f}} = \sum_i \left\{ 2A_+^i \epsilon m_\chi m_f s \mathcal{F}(s, m_\chi^2, m_f^2, m_{f_i}^2) \right. \\ \left. + B_+^i \left[-s + (m_\chi^2 + m_f^2 - m_{f_i}^2)s \mathcal{F}(s, m_\chi^2, m_f^2, m_{f_i}^2) \right] \right\}. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

A.2. $\chi\chi \rightarrow hh$ annihilation

There are totally three types of contributions to $\tilde{w}^{(hh)}(s)$:

(1) CP-even Higgs-boson ($S_1 = h, S_2 = H$) exchange:

$$\tilde{w}_S^{(hh)}(s) = \frac{1}{2} \left| \sum_{i=1,2} \frac{G_S^{\chi\chi S_i} G^{hh S_i}}{s - m_{S_i}^2 + i\Gamma_{S_i} m_{S_i}} \right|^2 (s - 4m_\chi^2); \quad (\text{A.15})$$

(2) neutralino exchange:

$$\tilde{w}_\chi^{(hh)}(s) = - \sum_{i,j} |G_S^{\chi\chi_i h}|^2 |G_S^{\chi\chi_j h}|^2 \left\{ \mathcal{T}_2 + \left[s + 2(m_\chi^2 - m_h^2) + 2\epsilon m_\chi (\epsilon_i m_{\chi_i} + \epsilon_j m_{\chi_j}) \right] \mathcal{T}_1 \right. \\ \left. - \left[\epsilon_i \epsilon_j m_{\chi_i} m_{\chi_j} (s - 4m_\chi^2) - (m_\chi^2 - m_h^2) (m_\chi^2 - m_h^2 + 2\epsilon m_\chi (\epsilon_i m_{\chi_i} + \epsilon_j m_{\chi_j})) \right] \mathcal{T}_0 \right. \\ \left. + \left[(\epsilon_i \epsilon_j m_{\chi_i} m_{\chi_j} + \epsilon m_\chi (\epsilon_i m_{\chi_i} + \epsilon_j m_{\chi_j})) (s - 4m_\chi^2) - (m_\chi^2 - m_h^2) (3m_\chi^2 + m_h^2) \right] \mathcal{Y}_1 \right. \\ \left. + \mathcal{Y}_2 + \epsilon m_\chi (\epsilon_i m_{\chi_i} - \epsilon_j m_{\chi_j}) \mathcal{Y}_0 \right\} (s, m_\chi^2, m_h^2, m_{\chi_i}^2, m_{\chi_j}^2); \quad (\text{A.16})$$

(3) S - χ interference:

$$\tilde{w}_{S\chi}^{(hh)}(s) = 2 \sum_{j=1,2} \text{Re} \left(\frac{G_S^{\chi\chi S_j} G^{hh S_j}}{s - m_{S_j}^2 + i\Gamma_{S_j} m_{S_j}} \right) I_{S\chi}, \quad (\text{A.17})$$

where

$$I_{S\chi} = \sum_i |G_S^{\chi\chi_i h}|^2 \left\{ 2\epsilon m_\chi \left[1 + (m_\chi^2 + m_{\chi_i}^2 - m_h^2) \mathcal{F}(s, m_\chi^2, m_h^2, m_{\chi_i}) \right] \right. \\ \left. - \epsilon_i m_{\chi_i} (s - 4m_\chi^2) \mathcal{F}(s, m_\chi^2, m_h^2, m_{\chi_i}) \right\}; \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Appendix B. Some auxiliary functions

In this Appendix we collect various auxiliary functions that appear in Appendix A.

First, we define

$$t_\pm(s, x, y) \equiv x + y - \frac{1}{2}s \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(s - 4x)(s - 4y)} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

then

$$\mathcal{F}(s, x, y, z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(s - 4x)(s - 4y)}} \ln \left| \frac{t_+(s, x, y) - z}{t_-(s, x, y) - z} \right| \quad (\text{B.2})$$

and

$$\mathcal{T}_2(s, x, y, z_1, z_2) = 1 + \frac{1}{(z_1 - z_2)} \left[z_1^2 \mathcal{F}(s, x, y, z_1) - z_2^2 \mathcal{F}(s, x, y, z_2) \right]; \quad (\text{B.3a})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_1(s, x, y, z_1, z_2) = \frac{1}{(z_1 - z_2)} \left[z_1 \mathcal{F}(s, x, y, z_1) - z_2 \mathcal{F}(s, x, y, z_2) \right]; \quad (\text{B.3b})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_0(s, x, y, z_1, z_2) = \frac{1}{(z_1 - z_2)} \left[\mathcal{F}(s, x, y, z_1) - \mathcal{F}(s, x, y, z_2) \right]; \quad (\text{B.3c})$$

$$\mathcal{Y}_2(s, x, y, z_1, z_2) = 1 + \frac{1}{(s - 2x - 2y + z_1 + z_2)} \left[z_1(s + z_1 - 2x - 2y) \mathcal{F}(s, x, y, z_1) \right. \\ \left. + z_2(s + z_2 - 2x - 2y) \mathcal{F}(s, x, y, z_2) \right]; \quad (\text{B.3d})$$

$$\mathcal{Y}_1(s, x, y, z_1, z_2) = \frac{1}{(s - 2x - 2y + z_1 + z_2)} \left[\mathcal{F}(s, x, y, z_1) + \mathcal{F}(s, x, y, z_2) \right]; \quad (\text{B.3e})$$

$$\mathcal{Y}_0(s, x, y, z_1, z_2) = \frac{1}{(s - 2x - 2y + z_1 + z_2)} \left[(s - 2(x + y - z_1)) \mathcal{F}(s, x, y, z_1) \right. \\ \left. - (s - 2(x + y - z_2)) \mathcal{F}(s, x, y, z_2) \right]. \quad (\text{B.3f})$$

References

- [1] For reviews on dark matter and its detection, see *e.g.*, V. Trimble, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **25** (1987) 425; J. R. Primack, B. Sadoulet, and D. Seckel, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **38** (1988) 751; D. O. Caldwell, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **5** (1990) 1543; P. F. Smith and J. D. Lewin, *Phys. Rep.* **187** (1990) 203.
- [2] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50** (1983) 387; H. Goldberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50** (1983) 1419; L. M. Krauss, *Nucl. Phys. B* **227** (1983) 556.
- [3] J. Ellis, J. S. Hagelin, D. V. Nanopoulos, K. A. Olive and M. Srednicki, *Nucl. Phys. B* **238** (1984) 453.
- [4] For a recent review see M. Davis, G. Efstathiou, C. S. Frenk, and S. D. M. White, *Nature* **356** (1992) 489.
- [5] See *e.g.*, E. Kolb and M. Turner, *The Early Universe* (Addison-Wesley, Redwood City, 1990).
- [6] For recent reviews see *e.g.*, K. Olive, *Phys. Rep.* **190** (1990) 307; D. Goldwirth and T. Piran, *Phys. Rep.* **214** (1992) 223.
- [7] J. Ellis, J. Hagelin, and D. V. Nanopoulos, *Phys. Lett. B* **159** (1985) 26; K. Griest, *Phys. Rev. D* **38** (1988) 2357; *Phys. Rev. D* **39** (1989) 3802(E); K. A. Olive and M. Srednicki, *Phys. Lett. B* **230** (1989) 78 and *Nucl. Phys. B* **355** (1991) 208; K. Griest, M. Kamionkowski, and M. S. Turner, *Phys. Rev. D* **41** (1990) 3565; J. Ellis, L. Roszkowski, and Z. Lalak, *Phys. Lett. B* **245** (1990) 545; L. Roszkowski, *Phys. Lett. B* **262** (1991) 59; K. Griest and L. Roszkowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **46** (1992) 3309; L. Roszkowski, *Phys. Lett. B* **278** (1992) 147; J. McDonald, K. A. Olive, and M. Srednicki, *Phys. Lett. B* **283** (1992) 80; S. Mizuta and M. Yamaguchi, *Phys. Lett. B* **298** (1993) 120; S. Mizuta, D. Ng, M. Yamaguchi, TU-410 (August 1992).
- [8] R. Flores, K. A. Olive and D. Thomas, *Phys. Lett. B* **245** (1990) 509; K. Olive and D. Thomas, *Nucl. Phys. B* **355** (1991) 192; S. Abel, S. Sarkar, and I. Whittingham, OUTP-92-10P (September 1992).
- [9] M.M. Nojiri, *Phys. Lett. B* **261** (1991) 76; J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, and K. Yuan, *Phys. Lett. B* **267** (1991) 219; J. Ellis and L. Roszkowski, *Phys. Lett. B* **283** (1992) 252.
- [10] J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, and K. Yuan, *Nucl. Phys. B* **370** (1992) 445.
- [11] J. Ellis and F. Zwirner, *Nucl. Phys. B* **338** (1990) 317; S. Kelley, J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, H. Pois, and K. Yuan, *Phys. Lett. B* **273** (1991) 423; M. Kawasaki and S. Mizuta, *Phys. Rev. D* **46** (1992) 1634; M. Dress and M. M. Nojiri, *Phys. Rev. D* **47** (1993) 376; S. Kelley, J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, H. Pois, and K. Yuan, *Phys. Rev. D* **47** (1993) 2461; R. Roberts and L. Roszkowski, RAL-93-003 and UM-TH-33/92.
- [12] J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, and A. Zichichi, *Phys. Lett. B* **291** (1992) 255.
- [13] J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, and H. Pois, *Phys. Rev. D* **47** (1993) 2468.

- [14] M. Srednicki, R. Watkins, and K. Olive, Nucl. Phys. B **310** (1988) 693.
- [15] P. Gondolo and G. Gelmini, Nucl. Phys. B **360** (1991) 145.
- [16] K. Griest and D. Seckel, Phys. Rev. D **43** (1991) 3191.
- [17] For a review see, A. B. Lahanas and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Rep. **145** (1987) 1.
- [18] See *e.g.*, S. Kelley, J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, H. Pois, and K. Yuan, Texas A & M University preprint CTP-TAMU-16/92 and CERN-TH.6498/92 (to appear in Nucl. Phys. B).
- [19] For reviews see: R. Arnowitt and P. Nath, *Applied N=1 Supergravity* (World Scientific, Singapore 1983); H. P. Nilles, Phys. Rep. **110** (1984) 1; and Ref. [17].
- [20] M. Matsumoto, J. Arafune, H. Tanaka, and K. Shiraishi, Phys. Rev. D **46** (1992) 3966; R. Arnowitt and P. Nath, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69** (1992) 725; P. Nath and R. Arnowitt, Phys. Lett. B **287** (1992) 89 and Phys. Lett. B **289** (1992) 368.
- [21] J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, H. Pois, and A. Zichichi, Phys. Lett. B **299** (1993) 262.
- [22] J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, H. Pois, X. Wang and A. Zichichi, Texas A & M University preprint CTP-TAMU-05/93 (to appear in Phys. Lett. B).
- [23] R. Arnowitt and P. Nath, Phys. Lett. B **299** (1993) 58 and Erratum; P. Nath and R. Arnowitt, NUB-TH-3056/92, CTP-TAMU-66/92 (revised).

Figure Captions

- Fig. 1. The thermal average $\langle\sigma v_{M\phi 1}\rangle$ (in arbitrary units) as a function of $y_z = (M_Z/2m_\chi)^2$ for a Z -pole dominance situation. The exact and traditional series expansion results are shown. Note that the second-order approximation gives negative thermal averaged annihilation cross sections right above the pole.
- Fig. 2. Same as Fig. 1 but for an h -pole dominance situation.
- Fig. 3. The ratios $\langle\sigma v_{M\phi 1}\rangle_{exact}/\langle\sigma v_{M\phi 1}\rangle_{approx}$ for the two approximate series expansions (first-order: dashed; second-order: solid) and for the two sample poles considered. The peak in the $a + bx + cx^2$ line is due to the series expansion changing sign at $y = 0.75$, giving negative (non-sensical) results for $0.75 < y \lesssim 1$. The bottom row plots show the slow convergence not-so-near the poles to the exact result.
- Fig. 4. The integrand in the thermal average (Eq. (2.9)) as a function of y for two representative values of y_R and the two poles considered. The $w(y)$ function is used in exact form (solid lines) and Taylor-expanded form up to first (dotted lines) and second (dashed lines) derivatives. Note that the expansions miss the poles completely, although these are killed-off when sufficiently away from the poles.
- Fig. 5. The calculated values of the neutralino relic density in the minimal $SU(5)$ supergravity model as a function of m_χ using the exact thermal average procedure. Note that the pole structure near the Z -pole is broader and shallower than that shown in Fig. 6 where the series approximation to the thermal average has been used.
- Fig. 6. Same as Fig. 5 but using the first order series approximation to the thermal average ($\langle\sigma v_{M\phi 1}\rangle = a + bx$).
- Fig. 7. Those points in parameter space where $\Omega_\chi h_0^2 < 1$ with the thermal average computed exactly. These results do not differ qualitatively from those shown in Fig. 2 in Ref. [21], where the series approximation to the thermal average was used.
- Fig. 8. Those points in parameter space where $\Omega_\chi^{exact}/\Omega_\chi^{approx} > 1$, which according to Fig. 3 should occur near and above the poles. The dashed lines indicate the Z - and h -poles.
- Fig. 9. Those points in parameter space where $\Omega_\chi^{exact}/\Omega_\chi^{approx} < 0.5$, which according to Fig. 3 should occur below the poles. The dashed lines indicate the Z - and h -poles, as well as the $\chi\chi \rightarrow hh$ threshold.